R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 530 PS 000 371

WHERE IS DAY CARE HEADING.

BY- REED, MILDRED A.

SEATTLE DAY NURSEY ASSN., WASH.

PUB DATE 8 FEB 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.56 12P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CHILDHOOD NEEDS, *CHILD CARE CENTERS, CHILD WELFARE, NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS, DAY CARE PROGRAMS, *DAY CARE SERVICES, FAMILY INVOLVEMENT, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, PRESCHOOL EDUCATION, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, *EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION, *GOAL ORIENTATION, SEATTLE

IN SEATTLE AND IN THE NATION, GOOD DAY CARE SERVICES MUST BE MADE MORE COMPREHENSIVE. A NARRATIVE OF THE EXPERIENCES OF THE SEATTLE DAY NURSERY ASSOCIATION SUGGESTS WAYS TO INITIATE AND SUSTAIN NEEDED CHILD CARE SERVICES. THESE SERVICES SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO FAMILIES WITH VARYING INCOMES WHO PAY FEES ON A SLIDING SCALE. EMERGENCY HELP FOR FAMILIES IN A CRISIS SHOULD INCLUDE HOME CARE GIVEN AT NIGHT AS WELL AS DURING PARENT OR CHILD ILLNESS. A CHILD CARE REGISTRY MIGHT RETAIN SUCH TRAINED EMPLOYEES AS RETIRED COUPLES TO HELP CARE FOR CHILDREN FROM 3 P.M. TO 11 P.M., TEEN-AGERS TO CARE FOR YOUNGSTERS AFTER SCHOOL, AND MATURE WOMEN TO PROVIDE HOME NURSING. IT HAS PROVED SUCCESSFUL TO RECRUIT MOTHERS FROM HOUSING PROJECTS TO BE TRAINED IN DAY CARE FOR THE CHILDREN OF FAMILIES IN THE IMMEDIATE NEIGHBORHOOD. CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION MUST BE CHANGED SO THAT IT FACILITATES, BUT DOES NOT COMPEL, THE USE OF DAY CARE CENTERS BY POVERTY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS. DAY CARE PROGRAMS MUST BE CAREFULLY PLANNED IF THEY ARE TO AVOID BEING MERELY CUSTODIAL. CASE HISTORIES RECORDED BY THE SEATTLE DAY NURSERY ASSOCIATION ARE INCLUDED. THIS PAPER WAS DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SEATTLE DAY NURSERY ASSOCIATION (SEATTLE, FEBRUARY 8, 1968). (MS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ANNUAL MEETING

of the

S E A T T L E D A Y N U R S E R Y A S S O C I A T I O N

February 8, 1968

Colonial Manor

"WHERE IS DAY CARE HEADING?"

Mildred A. Reed, MSW, ACSW
Executive Director, SDNA

Seattle Day Nursery Association
302 Broadway
Seattle, Washington 98122

A UNITED GOOD NEIGHBOR AGENCY

T7 003 S1

"WHERE IS DAY CARE HEADING?"

This topic, "Where Is Day Care Heading?" was chosen because things are happening in day care now, some rather good things and some rather alarming.

In the state of Washington, 1967 brought significant changes in the licensing law which is administered by the State Department of Public Assistance and which is the legal base for day care standards in this state. In January, the United Good Neighbor Board authorized staff work in three areas of the county, based on the Guide which had been prepared by a committee of the UGN Planning division, for ten multi-service centers, each to include day care facilities. This announcement was followed in mid-summer by the Forward Thrust plans for Community Recreation-Service Centers, a system of twelve multi-purpose centers, six in Seattle and six in King County, to include recreational, cultural, educational, governmental, and social services, including day care for children. Eleven of the centers would each have three major wings to accommodate the functions served: 1) a wing for public and private social service offices and program space; 2) a day care center for children of working mothers; and 3) a cultural recreation wing, including little theater, studio rooms, and multi-purpose space.

In the fall of 1967, we were asked to consider some responsibility for planning and operating a day care center in the Yesler-Atlantic Neighborhood Improvement Project. While we were studying how this could be done, Seattle received a Model Cities grant. It turns out that Yesler-Atlantic is right in the middle of the Model Cities area! It is no wonder that the query arose, "Does the right hand know what the left hand is doing?"

The answer, I think, is "Yes," locally at least. Some of the threads that have been running through all the local area planning to my mind do serve to inter-relate all of the developing plans. For instance, the UGN planning staff has been active in the committee work for each of these proposals. Staff members from UGN agencies and other organizations, together with interested and informed private citizens, have worked on committees or served as consultants in the tremendous job of collecting and organizing the information about community needs which provided the basis for all the proposals mentioned earlier. I have served as day care consultant to all these committees. The proposals seek funding from different sources. The over-lapping mix of committee memberships and their access to source material have resulted in a remarkably extensive and co-ordinated set of approaches to community problem-solving. The Forward Thrust ballot proposals would make it possible to implement plans for community-service centers in areas identified earlier by a UGN Planning Division Committee. There is no problem of duplication, but there is the 2-prong problem of funding for physical facilities and operating expenses.

The Model Cities Work Program for a model welfare center was developed by a committee which again included members who were thoroughly knowledgeable about the other proposals. The problems of day care are featured prominently in the Model Cities proposal.

Earlier, I said some good things are happening in day care and some alarming things. I underscore these plans I have just listed as good. I support the new licensing law in the state of Washington as an adequate place to start with an enforceable law. It replaces a law which set higher standards but was not enforceable and which exempted

from licensing all day care centers run by churches. The old law was a good one for its time. With that law in the book, and a day care specialist working from Olympia to guide center operators toward the standard-setting goals suggested in the regulations, the state of Washington was ahead of many states where the need for taking some responsibility for the protection of young children in day care was unrecognized. But community attitudes have been changing. An increasing body of public opinion requested enforceable regulations. A tragic fire in an unlicensed center and greater awareness of the damage to young children left in overcrowded centers where little or no attempt was made to meet the developmental needs of children, led to demands that regulations be rewritten to be enforceable and that the legislature put teeth in the law. During this period, church groups and councils of churches added a strong voice to requests that church-sponsored day care centers be covered by the licensing law and this change was made.

Prior to 1967, aside from the licensing regulations of the state of Washington, boards or operators who wished to establish good standards for day care turned to a manual on day care standards published by the Child Welfare League of America. This manual describes the developmental needs of young children--physical, intellectual, social--and suggests standards for personnel, physical facilities, and program activities to meet these needs.

As you know, federal funds have been available in the last three years through the Office of Economic Opportunity for the war on poverty. Some of this money, under Community Action Program, or CAP, was used to provide day care for children whose mothers entered training programs. If this happened in a state which licensed day care, these standards prevailed, but CAP provided no guidelines for standards. The focus was narrow, simply the need for training the mother to get a job. The needs of the child were overlooked. When Head Start became a part of the war on poverty, a massive attempt was begun to reach deprived four-year-olds. The nation was appalled by the knowledge of the deprivation suffered by these youngsters which was brought to light by Head Start efforts. For instance, 98,000 children with eye defects were discovered and treated. Of 900,000 dental cases examined, an average of five cavities per child was found. This knowledge helped to bring a listening ear to the advocates of good quality day care service. Congress decided that after September 1, 1967, all OEO funded day care should be provided under Head Start guidelines. This was a decision of tremendous importance, not only affecting the families served by the day care centers, but in the majority of American communities it provided the first opportunity to develop a model of a good day care center. Head Start guidelines are quite compatible with the standards mentioned earlier which are supported by the Child Welfare League; however, Head Start guidelines are backed by funds to implement to a large extent and this makes a significant difference.

Now let us take a look at the need for day care. There are many ways to describe the dimensions of the need for care of young children. Primarily, this talk will focus on the aspects of day-time services "for which the citizen must take responsibility in order to assure for children, parents, and the community the adequacy of such care in quantity, quality, variety, and geographic distribution."[1]

---

[1] "Day Care Definition." Newsletter. Volume 7, Number 4, Summer, 1967.

The summer, 1967, issue of the NCDC Newsletter quotes figures from Mrs. Oettinger, Chief of the Children's Bureau, which are a measure of the national need: 2,700,000 children need day care and 400,000 places are known to exist in day care centers. Our national concerns for young children have in recent times come to a fresh focus upon day care as a primary tool in prevention of cultural retardation and in the provision of early intervention in mental illness, in addition to day care to meet needs of working mothers. The documented need for services is enormous.

In the state of Washington in 1962 there were nearly 47,000 working mothers of children under six. The State Department of Public Assistance currently licenses 64 centers with a combined capacity of 2,541 children. 1900 family day care homes are licensed with a total capacity of 7,000. The tremendous gap between the number of children needing care and the number of places providing care is very real and believable to us at SDNA. The pressure of our waiting list is particularly acute because we are still the only agency in King County which sets fees on a sliding scale; thus, we serve those parents whose income makes them ineligible for the free day care in OEO funded centers but is inadequate to pay fees of commercially operated day care centers.

Figures describe one aspect of the need, and we must count them and use them with care and knowledge. But what about the people who ask for and use day care services? Let me give you some examples:

1. A young divorced mother is earning a very low income and cannot afford private care. She later marries a young man whose earning ability is also low, and it is necessary for her to continue at her job. The young couple are conscientious parents but could greatly benefit from parent education.

2. A grandmother is trying to make a home for her two preschool grandsons who have been deserted by their parents. She has been given custody by the court and would be unable to support them without day care since she is the head of her household.

3. The mother of two preschool children is trying to complete an education in psychiatric nursing. She has a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. Day care enables her to prepare for a very important social service.

4. A father enrolled his four-year-old son who had had a succession of unhappy placements off and on since birth because the alcoholic and promiscuous mother deserted the family periodically. The child presented many problems and the father was helped to accept referral to Children's Orthopedic Hospital for diagnostic evaluation. The child was found to be brain damaged, but improved markedly by the association in a normal group and the careful guidance of teachers at SDN. The father was helped to accept the boy as he was, to find more successful ways of dealing with the child's problems and to follow through on applying and enrolling the child in a special school to which we referred him. This boy was in care <u>eight months</u>.

5. A father, previously an alcoholic and in trouble with the law but now on his way back to health, in his second, very successful year studying electronics at Edison, applied for emergency care for his 4-year-old. The mother was bedridden with acute ulcerative colitis, and the Harborview M.D. had ordered

rest. Father would be out of the educational program if he lost more time. Care was given this active 4-year-old for seven weeks, until the mother recovered and a teenage daughter was through school and could help at home. Both parents felt this direct help at a time of crisis had prevented the father from "back sliding" and enabled him to successfully continue his rehabilitation.

Some of the families seeking day care appear to have a higher income, but let us look at the family's need:

1. Two parents, 10 children. Father a professional man. Fee $1.50 per day. Mother in intensive psychiatric treatment and this youngest child referred by University of Washington Hospital Child Psychiatry Dept. to our Center as next step in her regaining emotional health.

2. Father alone with one child. Good position in business. Paying $2.50 fee because of $300 monthly payments on $8,000 indebtedness for court and legal fees incurred in custody proceedings.

3. Two-parent Filipino family, both now working and raising themselves from low income level, with many debts from low income years. Now making over $700 per month. Six children and youngest at SDN at $1.50 per day. One handicapped child.

4. Very disturbed mother, a recent divorcee. Six more or less disturbed children and youngest at SDN at 75¢ per day. Mother's problems reflected in her need to make up to children by using $600 income to give them "advantages" and her inability to meet basic financial responsibilities. Mother needs intensive--probably long-term--psychiatric help but as yet unable to accept this.

More recently, we receive phone messages such as this: "I've been in the New Careers program four months and my neighbor has been looking after my five-year-old. Now she has a job and I can't find any baby-sitter. Can you help me so I can stay in the program?" Our waiting list usually has several emergency needs like this.

When we examine local resources to meet the day care needs, it becomes obvious why the growing concern for the care of young children has begun to crystalize in the planning of the OEO, of UGN, of Forward Thrust, of Yesler-Atlantic, and of Model Cities. The major emphasis on training and education as a step on the way out of poverty realistically requires many supportive services if it is to succeed. Chief among these is the provision of adequate day care for young children. This is particularly necessary in meeting needs of our target population where such a large percentage of families are single-parent families. The concern for the preschool children and the single-parent family in which mother or father must be away from home all day is a major one for the population served. It is the basis for our attempt to work out a day care program which combines support and education for the overburdened parent, the educational program and health and medical services of Head Start, plus the caring and nurturing elements of good day care for the deprived children.

In response to the expression of need for day care from the target areas of the local war on poverty, in 1966 the new central area OEO-funded agency Central Area Motivation Program began providing day care services in facilities donated by churches. CAMP is

now providing free day care for about 120 children from families with incomes below the poverty level.

In 1966, also, SDNA began a new, OEO-funded day care service which we subcontracted from Neighborhood House, Inc. We recruited and trained family day care mothers located in each of the Seattle Housing Authority's projects and in Park Lake Homes of the King County Housing Authority. The program serves at least two purposes. Number one, because we provided one social worker to supervise ten homes, and supported her training efforts with teaching and consultation from SDNA staff, we provided good day care for the 40 children we placed in these homes, plus affecting the care and supervision given by the mothers to their own children, numbering about 30 more children. The second purpose achieved was the beginning of a work skill, possibly a career line, for women who had been supported by public assistance before joining our program. That this pioneering, pilot program is successful is a tribute to their efforts and to the remarkable patience and skill of Mrs. Donna Berger, the social worker who implemented the plan.

Again responding to requests from the population voiced through advisory committees in each of the housing projects, we opened an OEO-funded group care center in West Seattle for 45 children on September 1, 1967. To illustrate how quickly things can happen with people of good will, in February of 1967, Pastor Lowell Erickson of St. James Lutheran Church phoned to voice his church's concern to make a practical contribution to the crying needs of their community; specifically, could their education wing be used for day care?

We found their education building unusually adaptable to day care needs. A young child in care away from home for nine to ten hours daily, five days a week, needs indoor and outdoor space that is unneeded for the comparatively short Sunday school program, so we were pleased to find well-lighted, spacious rooms and a safely fenced play area. Between February and September, 1967, the church established a Guidance Council to oversee the use of their building for day care and, with suprisingly few committee meetings to clarify our mutual goals and identify our separate responsibilites, signed a contract with SDNA to donate the use of specified areas for a day care service. This donation is worth $1,344 a month, which helps considerably to meet the 20% local matching funds required for eligibility for the 80% cash in federal funds. But we place a value above money on this church's donation. Without it, we wouldn't have a Head Start day care center today in West Seattle.

Perhaps you are puzzled by the term "Head Start Day Care." You may know about Head Start programs run by public schools to prepare disadvantaged children for kindergarten and you can visualize a classroom where four-year-olds are introduced to learning experiences. Your perspective on this is shaped by your own public school experience and perhaps some knowledge of morning nursery school classes for preschool children. Day care is still too often thought of as a custodial "baby-sitting" service. Head Start day care, or full-day Head Start, assures full day attention to the developmental and learning needs of children. All day, from morning arrival and greetings, through play and creative activities, through planned educational experience, through snack time, outdoor play, field trips, clean-up times, lunch, naptime, after-nap activities, late snack, and preparing to go home, a child in good day care is exposed to a learning experience of very significant importance. Learning occurs under the guidance of skilled teachers. For instance, mathematical concepts are learned by young children

playing with blocks, sorting objects, sharing cookies. Set theory is comprehensible to the child who has separated the spoons from the forks or the square blocks from the long ones. A child learns about comparison of sizes and "form" by playing with toys, nesting blocks, and graduated blocks. He learns which blocks are too long or too short for the house he's building and how he can substitute two short blocks for a long one. Construction toys often call for fitting things together, or fitting pegs into holes--a reciprocal relationship. Toys may also develop understanding of other spatial relationships--top and bottom, up and down, over and under, side by side.

We include in our teacher training the Erik H. Erikson material on biological-social development, a theoretical approach based upon the notion that in each stage of child development there is a central problem to be solved--a developmental task--if the child is to proceed with vigor to the next stage. In our Centers we often meet the child who has not developed a sense of trust. If from infancy a child has the experience of being heard, heeded, and helped in response to his distress signals, he feels able to communicate effectively with his small world and so he is trusting of it. A teacher needs to know how a child grows and how to identify deficiencies in the child's foundations for learning so that she can help him solve his problems and engage himself freely in learning.

A good day care center provides care and protection for children over a long day. A good center meets the educational needs of young children, offers the kind of stimulation which prepares a child to learn to use language, and the personal relationships which give emotional nurturance necessary to healthy growth.

Although good day care centers are scarce in relation to the need, working models do exist. And these centers, generally open from 7:00 a. m. to 6:00 p. m., are not only insufficient in numbers, but they are not able to meet some other child care needs which are vitally needed.

I personally favor a community in which a mother can choose to stay at home to care for her children and receive the help she needs to do a good job of child rearing, or can choose to place her children in good, supervised care and be trained for rewarding work or continue in an occupation for which she was previously trained. We don't have this kind of community in Seattle or in the United States. Our child-caring resources are a disgrace to our nation. We have not made the decision, as a people, to pay for quality care for our greatest national treasure--our children. We suffer and we pay a high cost for failing to make this decision.

Harry C. Bredemeier has described eloquently how we make a tragic misuse of welfare funds which we have allowed for far too long. He says, "There is one other service that requires special note. This is the parental service, as caretaker and primary educator of the young. If one thing is certain about the roots of contemporary poverty, it is that poverty-stricken adults are not capable of giving their children the skills and motivation required for success in today's complex world. Poverty-stricken parents themselves lack the necessary commitment to the complex, urban-industrial system; they lack the know-how; and they lack the resources with which to give their children stakes in respectability.

"The fact of the matter is that society does "employ" women to act as mothers, through the program of Aid to Dependent Children--but in a self-defeating manner. The program is self-defeating in two obvious ways: it encourages desertion by husbands and/or

fathers in order for their children to receive welfare payments; and it penalizes initiative and enterprise of mothers and their teenage children by reducing welfare payments in proportion to earnings.

"It is also self-defeating in a more subtle but perhaps even more important way: by failing to define the payment straightforwardly as wages for the service to society of properly caring for and socializing children, society both loses the possibility of expecting and requiring adequate socialization, and reinforces the alienation of ADC mothers from the mainstream of the urban-industrial world.

"Parents and teenagers in the poverty class are, in fact, helping to raise the next generation. How they do it--and whether productively or nonproductively--depends upon the kind and amount of help, support, training, and acceptance they are given. Given hand-outs grudgingly and with obvious distaste, they will participate sullenly and with minimum effort. Given valued employment in a vital enterprise, subject to the high standards that any important enterprise deserves, they are more than likely to respond with effort and commitment. If poverty-stricken parents had the duty, in return for reasonable wages, to learn and to practice child care and child training, they, their children, and society would be vastly better off." [2]

Let me tell you from our experience about some gaps in our services for children. We hear a cry for help with children of all ages and at all hours. The working mother whose children are sick can't bring them to a group care center. How long can she stay home with them before losing her job? How can a mother plan family schedules around her working hours of 3 to 11:00 p.m.? How about the mother, perhaps a hospital worker, whose hours include weekend work? Or the working mother who becomes ill herself and can't bring her children to day care?

Am I suggesting a 24-hour day care center to meet these gaps--these night-time and weekend needs? No, but I do recognize and feel deeply responsive to the cries for help. To really meet the needs of children, and thus to really meet the needs of parents, I feel strongly that care needed at night, or care needed irregularly, should be given at home so that a child has the security of familiar surroundings while the parent is away, or is sick, or the child is sick.

I would recommend a variation on an old theme: "in-home care." I would suggest that this service be provided by trained and supervised child care workers, administered by a child care registry which assumes responsibility for developing criteria for choosing child care workers for varying family needs. This could include high school students caring for young school-age children after school; a retired couple caring for children of the 3 to 11:00 p. m. worker by providing the evening meal, bedtime stories, and bedtime regularity; mature women trained in first aid and care of the ill child to be on call for the working mother whose child has the "flu." Some employees of the Child Care Registry would work regular evening or weekend hours for a regular salary. Others might be on call for special needs. They should be paid a monthly retainer fee plus an hourly rate for actual time spent in child care. We need to find emotionally and physically healthy persons for this work, train them, provide good supervision and pay them a decent salary. The child care service should not be confused with homemaker service which often involves helping a parent become

---

[2] Harry C. Bredemeier, Trans-action. Volume 2, Number 1, Nov-Dec., 1964

more adequate.

This Registry should be subsidized through a combination of private and public funds so that fees could be charged on a sliding scale or the service could be free. I would suggest that the criteria for eligibility for free service include temporary relief from total responsibility for child care. To adequately care for young children, without undue stress upon the mother, a mother needs to be surrounded by help from a husband, grandparents, sisters, etc. In the absence of these, I think it is necessary for a concerned community to provide other assistance. Such help could be of crucial importance in alleviating the stresses that cause depression and emotional breakdown in mothers of young children.[3]

There is another service gap that we at SDNA are troubled about. One example may illustrate what we mean by "family in crisis," which is the last service gap I will dwell upon tonight. I had been at SDN about two years when the behavior of one mother was called to my attention. At that time we had one social work position and it was not filled. I was the social worker as well as the director and so the branch supervisor told me about the young mother of two children in our care who was failing to come for her children until 6:00 p.m., and later, although she lived and worked nearby and was through work at 4:00 p.m. The supervisor also said there were unusual aspects about the mother's behavior and she didn't think it wise to speak routinely to her about the long, tiring day for the children. I waited for the mother one night to see what I could discover about the problem. I found a very ill young woman who was barely able to keep contact with the real world. She was hallucinating, hearing voices, and responding to them. She seemed to be floating in space and only with persistence could I get response from her. Because we have rather observant staff, I estimated her condition must be repidly deteriorating and approaching a crisis. The supervisor and I conferred, made phone calls and made emergency plans. We were concerned to maintain familiar connections for the anxious children and to utilize for the mother the strength of the trust she felt in our ability to help her. We handled that emergency by taking the children that night to her sister, but the sister's circumstances didn't allow her to house the ill mother. I took her home with me. The next morning she went willingly with me to University Hospital where, in Emergency, she was diagnosed as psychotic and suicidal and accepted for treatment.

It's a long story and a depressing one. We helped that family at intervals over the next year. When the sister couldn't keep the children, our secretary found a wonderful foster family on Mercer Island who were interested in helping. The sister took legal responsibility and placed the children in the island home. Throughout our efforts to help the mother, we were encouraged by what we saw as usable strengths. The mother loved and cared intelligently for her children--as she was able. Her co-workers cared for her--they helped her do her work, I'm sure. Her sister cared. But the young mother during this period needed 24-hour help and protection for herself and her children.

---

[3] Dr. Virginia L. Larsen, "Problems Young Mothers Face," Perspective, Volume II, No. 3

That story has an unhappy ending. I last saw the family fragmented and becoming sicker. And then we had other families in crisis, families where the parent or parents cannot cope with family life, parenting, work, and is, therefore, headed for an emotional or psychotic break. In some cases, the parent is literally not capable of caring for the children since she (he) is subject to disorganized behavior, delusions and/or paranoia and in most cases is eventually unable to work. In a day care center, the staff observes when a parent is under unusual stress and is reaching a point of not being able to cope effectively with family responsibility. In some cases, the children are actually in danger. Unless a parent gets help at this point (help being not only counseling but alleviation of some responsibility), there is usually a dramatic break which results in emergency care, then hospitalization and the children being "farmed out." After treatment, there is an abrupt difficult re-entry into the family situation with no time for taking on responsibility gradually. This is obviously a less than optimal condition for cure.

I worried about this for several months before I could visualize a plan which might undergird the strengths we see in each of these stricken families. I haven't developed a budget for it and have only the barest outline on paper, but I am going to describe it to you because something like this is desperately needed and perhaps you can help me with it.

I've proposed for Families in Crisis some form of joint or adjacent housing units with provisions for seven families and a caring family in the same complex. The caring family would look after, counsel, and arrange for alleviation of some parental responsibilities, depending on the family's ability to cope with its own needs. Psychiatric consultation would be available and emergency care and the treatment available to the parents.

Each parent would be at a different level of crisis and would be expected to contribute to group living and rehabilitation of every other family by using whatever skills and effective behavior he had at any given time. This might take the form of individual child care, a small parent co-operative, mending, cooking, hair-setting, or whatever competency a parent had to contribute to other families in the complex.

I would expect that this remedial experience, offered during the years when responsibilities for dependent children make the burdens of life overwhelming, could help many parents gain strength and control over their own behavior so as to eventually take their places in the outside world as effective and coping persons.

Will there be public funds available for expanded day care services such as these? The answers are not clear and unequivocal. We will have to work for answers. These are insistent and difficult times. They press us to constantly search out answers to our more difficult social and economic problems. We are running out of time for making uncaring choices of whether to spend money on material objectives or on human conservation.

We are experiencing rapid changes which bring about major alterations in society as we struggle with our value system regarding war and peace, with the population explosion, with minority and urban problems. Old political theories based on an agricultural society are not adequate to meet present day circumstances. We are arriving at the day of paying the price for delay in dealing with the declining effectiveness of schools, social agencies, and welfare institutions. Individual inaction and absence of public policy to solve complex social problems bring us closer to the moment of

truth. Can we allocate funds nationally and locally to provide for human needs?

Congress tries--in contradictory ways. Congress liked the Head Start program, apparently, and by its support gave unprecedented visibility to the educational and developmental needs of young children. But then in the latter half of 1967, as Congress considered the Social Security amendments of 1967, punitive measures affecting AFDC mothers were included in the amendments. Along with requirements that mothers on AFDC accept employment came authorization for a tremendously expanded day care program.

Let me quote from a statement made at a Senate Finance Committee hearing on HR 12080, the Social Security Amendments:

"It is probably difficult for you to appreciate how much anguish this legislation has caused those of us who are dedicated to the promotion of expanded day care programs. For almost ten years, the National Committee for the Day Care of Children has worked to persuade the Federal Government to provide decent day care facilities for the millions of American children who need or might benefit from them. We have campaigned for increased funds, more facilities, better training and higher standards for day care programs. We have repeatedly urged the nation to eliminate the disgraceful situation in which millions of American children are left to fend for themselves or under wholly inadequate supervision during the day. In that time, we have seen the Congress take the first steps toward providing for the welfare of these children.

"Today we find ourselves in the strange and uncomfortable position of having to say that the largest single Federal day care program ever proposed is a bad program . . . (which) is likely to do the children it affects as much harm as good.

"When we first heard that the Congress was considering establishing a massive day care program for children of parents on public assistance, we were elated. We thought that such legislation would embody a recognition of the role day care can play in breaking the vicious circle of poverty and dependence. We find, however, not a carefully thought out program to help children develop mentally and physically, but a hastily put together outline for a compulsory, custodial service which is not required to maintain even minimal standards of adequacy.

"In the first place, the day care program is, for all practical purposes, mandatory. A "good" "mandatory" day care program is a contradiction in terms. No mother should be forced to place her children in day care so that she can go to work. The judgment as to whether a young child needs his mother's constant care and attention is one that in our society traditionally belongs first of all to the mother. Society may intervene only when the child is in physical danger. In this instance, however, we are proposing to intervene in circumstances which relate not to danger but to poverty. Such a pattern of intervention may be appropriate in totalitarian countries. <u>It is not appropriate in America</u>.

"In addition, some children can benefit from day care and some cannot. Many children may be damaged emotionally and physically by being taken from their homes and being placed in a setting with which they are not ready to cope. Day care professionals are the last to urge day care for all children. They know that a prerequisite of a good program is a professionally administered, discriminating intake procedure. Such a process must work in consultation <u>with</u> the mother to determine the appropriateness of day care for her children.

"The second serious problem with the bill is its failure to set any standards for day care services or even to indicate that such standards should be set. This is a deficiency which, in our view, must be corrected.

"A licensing provision similar to that already applicable to the day care programs funded under the child welfare provisions of the Act should also be written into the program.

"Our recent experience with the Head Start Program indicates that there must be provision of funds for the building and renovation of facilities. Lacking this, it will be impossible to start a large scale program in many cities, and even more, in rural areas. In addition, there must be provision for the training of teachers and other staff, and for the provision of health and guidance services, unless what is contemplated is a purely custodial "baby sitting" service. If this latter is the case, our country will be in the anomalous position of giving some children a headstart, while giving others a push backward. If what is contemplated is a system of meting out punishment to the children of AFDC mothers, such a custodial program would be eminently qualified to succeed.

"We believe that the mandatory work provisions, the lack of a minimum wage scale for working mothers, the incentives offered to States to remove illegitimate children from their homes, and the implicit pressure on unemployed fathers to leave their families may lead to wholesale migration from areas where the law is enforced too literally into areas which appear to be more liberal and therefore safer. If this leads to increased migration on any large scale into cities which cannot afford to absorb additional low income families, nor to provide the space, staff, or funds to meet the additional need for day care, we predict a period of misery, frustration, and backbreaking problems for our already overburdened cities."

Despite strong protests, including action of the Council of Senior Citizens opposing the restrictive welfare provisions even if this meant a delay in when the social security cash benefits would be available, these amendments were approved December 15, 1967.

President Johnson has been asked to prepare legislation, immediately upon the convening of the Second Session of the 90th Congress, which would eliminate these punitive features.

Working with the effects of this legislation and working to change it seems likely to be a central task of 1968, particularly for those of us in the day care field. But it can have widespread ramifications affecting as it does, education, employment, and welfare.

Knowing what we know now of the needs of young children and how costly it is to repair emotional and physical damage to them and how difficult to provide help for the learning and social deficits, can we allow the establishment of a widespread system of custodial baby sitting services? Even if we were untouched by the plight of the thousands of children and their familes, can we <u>afford</u> this waste of human potential?

Where is day care heading? It is heading toward the gravest crisis in its history.

MR:vp
2/13/68 629-a